

REMARKS

In the outstanding Official Action, election was required as between the species in I) the embodiment of Fig. 1 and II) the embodiment of Fig. 3. In response, Applicants hereby elect the species I) the embodiment of Fig. 1, with traverse, for an examination of Claims 1-22 on the merits. Applicants respectfully believe that the claims are generic to both species. Additionally, Applicants contend that Fig. 1 and Fig. 3 do not lack unity of invention. They both represent a single inventive concept under PCT rule 13.1 at least because they both depict embodiments of the same invention. Fig. 1 simply depicts the invention in a more basic structure than Fig. 3. Applicants fail to comprehend why these would be considered different inventive concepts.

A favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Aaron Waxler, Reg. 48,027

(914) 333-9608

February 7, 2006